

Hans Blumenfeld the Man

by Albert Rose, 1983

Edited by John R. Hitchcock
Anne McMaster

With the assistance of Judith Kjellberg

The Metropolis

**Proceedings of a Conference
in Honour of Hans Blumenfeld**

University of Toronto
November 4-5, 1983

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND
CENTRE FOR URBAN AND COMMUNITY STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

© Governing Council
University of Toronto
1985

Printed in Canada

ISBN 0-7727-8151-6

Published with the assistance of a grant from
The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
Introduction	1
John Hitchcock	
Hans Blumenfeld the Man	11
Albert Rose	
THE CHANGING METROPOLIS	
What Lies Ahead for Urban America?	17
Brian J. L. Berry	
U.S.-Canadian Differences:	37
A Response to Brian Berry	
Michael Goldberg	
The Changing Metropolis and the Blumenfeld Blues	47
Len Gertler	
Metropolitan Form: A Response to Len Gertler	69
Gerald Hodge	
TRANSPORTATION IN THE METROPOLIS	
Issues in Transit Policy	71
Juri Pill	
Alternative Perspectives on Transit Issues:	81
A Response to Juri Pill	
Bruce Hutchinson	
Urban Transportation Planning:	85
A Retrospective Analysis	
Ron Rice	
Demand Oriented Perspectives on Transportation	117
Planning: A Response to Ron Rice	
Ralph Gakenheimer	
Technology and Politics:	125
A Response to Juri Pill and Ron Rice	
Josef Kates	

HOUSING IN THE METROPOLIS

Some Present and Future Aspects of Housing and the Third Sector Jeanne Wolfe	131
Some Additional Problems and Challenges for Co-ops: A Response to Jeanne Wolfe Guy Legault	157
Housing in Existing Communities George Przybylowski	161
Will Neighbourhoods Accept Intensification? A Response to George Przybylowski Frank Lewinberg	175
Some U.S. Perspectives on Co-ops and Use of Existing Housing: A Response to Jeanne Wolfe and George Przybylowski William Grigsby	183

THE LIVEABLE URBAN ENVIRONMENT

What Makes a Good City? Kevin Lynch	189
A Form of Good City Theory: A Response to Kevin Lynch Alan Waterhouse	195
Ecological Analysis in the Urban Habitat Pierre Dansereau	201
Small Steps and Grand Plans: A Response to Pierre Dansereau John Sewell	225

CONCLUSIONS

Summing Up Hans Blumenfeld	229
-------------------------------	-----

CONTRIBUTORS	237
---------------------	-----

THE WRITINGS OF HANS BLUMENFELD	241
--	-----

Introduction

JOHN HITCHCOCK

The scale and complexity of metropolitan areas has been a source of continuing fascination for observers and analysts in planning and urban studies beginning early in the 1950s and extending through the whole post-war era. Just as there seemed to be a relatively complete and solid documentation of the various elements and processes encompassed by metropolitan development, the phenomena under investigation began to change in significant ways, giving rise to the current intense debate about the nature of those changes. The early years of the 1980s presented us with an urgent need to reassess our views on metropolitan change, and an important opportunity for verifying trends, as a new round of census material appeared in both Canada and the United States.

It was in this context that late in 1982 a decision was made to begin planning a major conference on the metropolis. An additional reason for the timing of the conference was the happy circumstance that one of the distinguished observers of the metropolis during the entire post-war period, Hans Blumenfeld, was still actively teaching and contributing his unique insights to the professional literature. Colleagues, friends, and former students had for some time been thinking about an appropriate way to express their appreciation and acknowledge his contribution, so it was an obvious choice to hold the conference in his honour. This volume contains the proceedings of that conference, entitled *The Metropolis*, held at the University of Toronto in the Fall of 1983. Since the conference was designed to honour Hans Blumenfeld, as well as to review the status of a number of sub-fields of metropolitan analysis, an introduction to this volume is, first of all, an introduction to Hans Blumenfeld.

There is an immediate temptation to say that Hans Blumenfeld is a man who needs no introduction. This would solve the problem immediately. In point of fact there are many people for whom no introduction is necessary. Many urban planners and urbanists in Canada, the United States, England, Europe, the Soviet Union, and many other countries, are familiar with his writings and his professional work. Another large group of people are familiar with his work in the cause of peace and disarmament. For these people there is no difficulty in explaining what all the fuss is about. But those outside these groups, and perhaps even the younger people within them, need some explanation, and therein lies the problem. There is no single accomplishment or attribute which adequately accounts for the respect and affection of so many colleagues; one has to have the complete package, so to speak, before the explanation is clear.

Perhaps the best way to proceed is to build up a composite portrait, step by step. One of Blumenfeld's most striking attributes has been his sheer durability. At the time this conference was held in the Fall of 1983, he was in his ninety-second year. This is astonishing enough, particularly if one had been privileged to be at the conference to see him deliver his summation while standing, and with the aid of only the barest minimum of notes. What is less visible, perhaps, is the fact that the organizers confidently began the planning of the conference a year earlier, when Blumenfeld was only ninety-one! At the time this Introduction was being written, early in 1985, the International Union of Architects had just awarded Blumenfeld its Patrick Abercrombie prize for town planning (jointly with Lucio Costa, planner for Brasilia). He was still actively writing professional articles and contributing comments to the daily newspapers. These papers and commentaries represent the distillation of seven decades of professional work in Germany, Austria, the Soviet Union, the United States, and, for the past thirty years, Canada. (The reader is directed to Albert Rose's paper for a fuller outline of his career.)

Sheer longevity, however, is only part of the story. A complementary element is the longevity of his ideas. A few examples may be useful. In the literature of housing analysis much attention has been given to the increasing importance of non-family households in housing demand. In the Toronto region the significance of this phenomenon was forcefully brought home by the 1976 census which revealed

a significant population loss in the City of Toronto, in part occasioned by the increasing proportion of smaller, non-family households. As Jeanne Wolfe has noted in the housing section of this volume, however, Blumenfeld wrote a paper anticipating all this in the 1940s. Similarly, Ron Rice's paper and Gakenheimer's commentary on it in the Transportation section, both make liberal mention of Blumenfeld's capacity for focussing attention on basic and durable issues. In Jeanne Wolfe's phrase, he has always sought the trends rather than the trendy. His work is of lasting importance, not just a contribution in the time period in which it was originally written. In a field such as planning, which is noted for rapidly changing fads and fashions, this is a considerable accomplishment.

This is still only part of the story, however. We must also take account of the way his work has appeared. The Appendix to this volume includes a bibliography of his work. Those who browse through this or through the two collections of his essays, The Modern Metropolis (1967) and Metropolis . . . and Beyond (1979), will be struck by the diversity of publication outlets; there are, to be sure, extensive articles in respected professional journals, but there are also brief remarks in newsletters, book reviews, addresses, professional reports, and a variety of essays which were previously unpublished in any formal sense, though they may have been circulated to a small group for information or comment. We must thank the editor of those volumes, Paul Spreiregen, who recognized the wise counsel which is to be found in all his writings, however humble the container in which they may be found. The impression created by this pattern of publication is one of an absence of self promotion. Blumenfeld has frequently commented that he has always done what he wanted (said with a large measure of pride and a small measure of sheepishness); this enjoyment of independence is undoubtedly mirrored in the way he has chosen to disseminate his ideas. When he had something to say he immediately sent it out the nearest available outlet and went on to the next interesting problem. It is a form of self indulgence which we all may envy.

The style of Blumenfeld's written work is clear and deceptively simple. Even his most complex pieces, such as "The Economic Base of the Metropolis: Critical Remarks on the Basic-Nonbasic Concept", referred to by William Grigsby in his remarks on the housing papers in this volume,

is accessible to the non-professional. It looks easy, and it requires a survey of the urban literature to see how difficult it really is.

The style itself reflects the personality. In reading his work one does not receive just pure fact or opinion, but a sense of the kind of experience and orientation which has led him to choose this or that particular problem and solution. This is an important part of the information imparted, a fact which we tend to ignore in assessing much professional or academic writing. At the risk of trying the reader's patience, we have included the opening paragraphs of Blumenfeld's introduction to his second collection of essays, Metropolis . . . and Beyond, in order to give some sense of the personality amongst the words.

When I published my book, The Modern Metropolis, in 1967, a friendly reviewer hailed it as my legacy. This well-intentioned remark was, to quote Mark Twain, slightly premature.

To continue to live beyond the biblical threescore years and ten certainly has its rewards. Many heresies that I have been preaching for decades have now become accepted dogma. That is, of course, very comforting to my ego; but it has the drawback that I now feel compelled to combat these new dogmas and myths.

For half a century I have warned against excessive use of the automobile in cities and tried to promote public transportation, in particular rail transit. Now I find it necessary to question the new religion that expects to find salvation by building a few rapid transit lines and regards any urban freeway as a straight road to hell.

For a quarter century I have been critical of low density suburbs and concerned with the problem of the scale of skyscrapers. Now I have to point out that 'high-density low-rise' is not a universal formula for urban living. I have opposed any form of rigid isolationist planning, be it an 'enclosed' neighborhood or a 'pure' zone. Now I fear that the newfound enthusiasm for mixing all uses, household types, income groups, and building forms may produce chaos rather than the hoped-for vitality.

The attentive reader will notice that I seem to be bent on burning my idols. While in one place I criticize our treatment of land as a commodity,

I subsequently dismiss the now standard formula 'land is a resource, not a commodity' as vacuous. While 12 years ago I wrote that 'the gods of the sacred soil will not tolerate forever the violation of their laws,' in a recent piece I ridicule the 'true believers of the sacred soil.'

The most significant change, however, occurred in my view of the role of the planner. I have proudly proclaimed myself a universal dilettante and often annoyed my colleagues who strive for recognition as professionals by saying, 'there ain't no such animal as a planner; man is a planning animal.' I do not retract that statement but I have to admit that while all men (and women) are planners, some are more planners than others. Like any other human ability, the ability to plan is developed by study and practice. (p. v)

As can be seen from this excerpt, Blumenfeld's style has a certain charming modesty about it, but this can be deceptive, too, since it has a tendency to mask the depth of his humanistic concerns. In his professional work these are reflected in his positions on urban renewal and housing. His essays on urban renewal in the United States and Canada, which appear in The Modern Metropolis, are good examples of his concern that urban change not come at the expense of the poor. His remarks in those papers are characteristic in the sense that they were delivered early and heeded only much later. Both collections of essays reflect his continuing commitment to public housing, a commitment frequently noted by Jeanne Wolfe and Guy Legault in this volume.

His most passionate commitment is to the cause of peace and disarmament. Albert Rose's remarks about his experience in the First World War, when he lost his brother, help explain the depth of this commitment. In an effort to promote the cause of peace, as Frank Lewinberg has noted in his comments in the housing section, Blumenfeld passed out leaflets on cold and windy street corners in Toronto, tirelessly engaging passersby in a discussion of the need for disarmament. In his late eighties he ran as a candidate in Toronto's Rosedale riding in order to publicize disarmament issues. This particular commitment is only very faintly reflected in his professional writing, but it is a source of great admiration and respect among those who are familiar with it. Josef Kates's remarks in the transportation section note this quality of the man.

There is one story about him which we can't resist, since it illustrates the intensity of his concerns, as well as an endearing quality of dealing with issues in the most direct manner possible. During the Vietnam War Blumenfeld was active in assisting draft resisters from the United States. On one occasion he had been engaged all night in driving resisters to various locations in Canada. One version of the story had it that he drove them across a frozen lake; this is improbable, but not impossible. In any event he was rather exhausted at the time of his class in the late afternoon of the following day, and during a student presentation he fell asleep. After a bit of whispered consultation, the students decided that he needed a rest more than they needed a class so they quietly filed out of the room.

As the reader may now suspect, Blumenfeld does not fit into any conventional pigeonhole. He has achieved notable professional success in both practice and academic work by virtue of a profound common sense which is, unfortunately, rather uncommon. He has been capable enough and strong enough to do this while maintaining his integrity and independence at every step of the way, perhaps even savouring the chance to tweak the nose of authority or challenge the conventional wisdom. During the McCarthy era in the United States he was questioned by the authorities about his affiliation with a number of "left-wing" organizations. In some cases Blumenfeld expressed uncertainty, but indicated that if he wasn't a member it was only through oversight. In a somewhat similar vein, in his role as a respected academic, he has been known to note with some pride that he has never received a grant because he never applied for one.

Organization of the Volume

It is hoped that these brief comments may give some hint of the source of affection, as well as respect, for Blumenfeld and his work. The structure of the conference and of this volume reflect the themes which are to be found most frequently in Blumenfeld's professional writing. Those not familiar with Blumenfeld's work will be struck by the broad range of his interests. He has at least one classic paper in each of the four broad fields which were selected for the conference. In the current pattern of professional

life it is unusual to find people who are prepared to address more than one or two areas of specialization. It is very rare indeed to find anyone who writes both on questions of housing and design on the one hand, and transportation and economic issues on the other.

The section on The Changing Metropolis recalls his work on the economic base and physical form of the metropolis, found in the first collection of his essays, as well as his more recent efforts to determine whether the slow down in metropolitan growth is a reflection of a new metropolitan form, or the continuation of an old one. Writings on this latter topic are to be found in his second volume of essays, as well as publications completed subsequent to that collection.

The section on Transportation acknowledges his essays ranging from detailed concern with the physical design of public transportation vehicles and systems, reflected, for example, in his discussion of the Montreal subway in the first collection of essays, to those concerned with the broad relationship of transportation to urban form found in the second volume. We have already alluded to Blumenfeld's continuing concern with housing issues. Papers and commentary on these issues comprise the third section of the volume.

Finally, it is not surprising that someone who was originally trained as an architect should have a continuing interest in urban design. In planning the conference, when Blumenfeld was asked for comment he indicated that he thought "urban design" was too narrow a designation; environmental quality should include a much broader range of topics. The title of the last section, The Liveable Urban Environment, then, is intended to reflect that view. In fact, in reviewing his essays, one will note that his earlier writings tend to deal with issues which are closer to the design end of the spectrum, while his later ones reflect more recent societal concerns, such as pollution and energy conservation.

These broad themes were used to select a group of distinguished Canadian and American planners and urbanists who could comment on recent developments within each field of interest. This volume, therefore, is both a tribute to Blumenfeld and a significant contribution to our understanding in these four fields of planning and urban studies. This Introduction would not be complete without one further glimpse of Blumenfeld's approach to professional issues.

After the organizers had defined the themes of the conference, they asked Blumenfeld to give the contributors some guidance as to his current concerns within each theme by selecting a few papers or perhaps by preparing some sort of statement. Blumenfeld's choice was to prepare a set of questions. In submitting these to the organizers he noted that they undoubtedly needed refinement, and probably needed to be reduced in number. The continual attempt to refine things to their essence is entirely characteristic. We conclude with Blumenfeld's questions.

The Changing Metropolis

1. What are the changes occurring and likely to occur in the functions and spatial structure of metropolitan areas and their fringes?
2. Is there a reversal of the secular trend to concentration in major agglomerations or (and) a spatial extension of the other secular trend to decentralization within urban-metropolitan areas?
3. Is the distinction between metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas losing its meaning?
4. What planning problems are developing in the metropolitan fringe?

Transportation

1. Is there a positive or inverse correlation between size of origin and destination points of long-distance freight and person movement and cost and energy effectiveness?
2. Are technical means of intra-metropolitan freight movement other than motor vehicles available or likely to become available?
3. What are the handicaps of collective versus individual transportation?
4. What are the social costs of individual versus collective transportation?
5. What are the relative weights of vehicle and right-of-way choices for the effectiveness of person transportation?
6. Is individual transportation by public carrier feasible?
7. Is congestion a valid criterion for the evaluation of transportation?

Housing

1. Why do people and governments practically everywhere consider it necessary to have a "housing policy", while they do not have a "clothing policy" or even generally a "food policy"?
2. Who have been the proclaimed and the actual beneficiaries of housing policies in Canada and the United States?
3. What are the trends in household composition as to couples and singles with no, small, or adolescent children, respectively? Which dwelling types are more or less well suited for each type?
4. What is the relative weight which people assign to satisfaction with their dwelling unit and their streets, respectively?
5. What does the term "affordable housing" mean?
6. What makes a house (or other dwelling unit) a home?

The Liveable Urban Environment

1. Can and should we classify negative environmental phenomena as temporary or permanent, local or global, threatening pleasure or health, threatening individuals or the biosphere?
2. Can and should we replace the concept of "removal of waste" by "recycling and re-use of the by-products of production and consumption". What are the limits of recycling?
3. Is recycling more feasible in small or large settlements?
4. What is the relative importance for human health, happiness, and behaviour of the physical and of the human ("social") environment, respectively?
5. How important is aesthetic satisfaction with the environment, and what are its most effective (positive and negative) elements?
6. Is our need for energy facing us with a Hobson's choice between two environmentally dangerous methods, combustion or nuclear fission? Which is the greater danger?

Hans Blumenfeld the Man

ALBERT ROSE

Few persons are given the opportunity of surviving into the tenth decade of life. Even fewer among us have the rare opportunity of exceeding ninety years while still possessed of all or most of our physical and emotional faculties. The person to whom this conference is dedicated is one of those very rare individuals.

From a purely demographic point of view the special nature of this occasion may be underlined very simply. The population projections for Ontario at the time of the census of 1991 suggest that there will be, among those ninety plus years of age, 3.6 females for each male. Moreover for the year 2001 the ratio will be 4 to 1 in favour of surviving females. While it is true that Hans Blumenfeld was not born in Ontario he has been a resident since 1955, and it can be assumed that a substantial portion of his longevity and the forces which have effected it are products of our rare environment in all its aspects.

The basic facts of Dr. Blumenfeld's career are well known to many persons, but it is conceivable that many among you have not read the essential curriculum vitae. In any event, a brief recapitulation may serve to underline some of the points which must be made in any tribute to our honoured guest. For those who want a more complete account, Norman Pressman wrote a substantial personal essay published in Plan Canada in March 1976. More recently Alan Waterhouse of the University of Toronto sketched Hans's life and career in the Newsletter of the Canadian Institute of Planners for October 1983. For those who do not have access to these Canadian materials, Appendix (A) in the second major book of essays written by Dr. Blumenfeld, Metropolis . . . and Beyond, published in 1979, will provide substantial detail.

It has been my good fortune to have had an opportunity to listen to six hours of conversation between David Hulchanski of the University of British Columbia and Hans, recorded in 1978-79. These materials, kindly provided by Dr. Hulchanski, were an attempt to record the history of Dr. Blumenfeld from his earliest days until his arrival in Toronto and his years with the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. In these records Hans laughs a good deal, both at the circumstances of his life and at himself. It was a pleasure to listen to this lively discussion and to realize that this man, presenting his recollections, was then more than eighty-five years of age.

Hans Blumenfeld was born in Osnabruck, West Germany in 1892. He entered architectural studies in the Technische Hochschule in Munich in 1911, and continued his studies under distinguished architects, planners and historians in Karlsruhe until 1914. During World War I, he served as a private in the German army for four years. Hans admits this must be somewhat of a record. When David Hulchanski asked him what sort of training he had in 1914-15, Hans replied "I was small and didn't see very much of what they were demonstrating". Nevertheless, Hans's war was made more tolerable by the fact that wherever he was stationed in Europe he seemed to have a relative. There were aunts, uncles, and cousins in Romania and in Russia and these family connections helped a good deal when he was recuperating from minor wounds and sometimes serious illnesses.

Unfortunately Dr. Blumenfeld lost his older brother, whom he much admired and who had studied law and political science at Cambridge. He has never forgotten this loss and, to a substantial degree, his later efforts on behalf of the peace movement are dedicated to his brother and his family.

After the war he resumed his studies in Munich and in 1921 he earned his degree from the Technische Hochschule in Darmstadt. For three years he worked in the United States: in New York, Baltimore and Los Angeles; returned to Hamburg in 1927, and for three years thereafter worked in Vienna, participating in a notable housing competition won by the famous architect Walter Gropius.

In 1930 he accepted an invitation to work in the Soviet Union, attracted like many others by what appeared to be an atmosphere of creativity and social purpose. He was a member of the Russian State City Planning Institute in Moscow and Gorki for three years; worked on various city plans from 1933 to 1935; returned to Moscow in the latter

year to become head of the architectural division of the Moscow Provinces Project Trust. Within two years, however, his situation became precarious and he was compelled to leave. His German passport had expired, but in 1937 he managed to escape to France and by virtue of the residence of his sister and brother-in-law in the United States, during the previous fifteen years, he obtained a visa and arrived in New York in 1938.

Soon thereafter he served as an architect and planner on public housing projects in New Jersey; was active in the Citizen's Housing and Planning Council of New York City; and worked with distinguished planning and housing specialists, notably Charles Abrams, Henry Churchill and Albert Mayer. In 1941 he made one of the most important moves of his life when he accepted a research post with the Philadelphia Housing Association where he remained until 1944, by which time he had become an American citizen. For the next seven years he was on the staff of the City Planning Commission of Philadelphia, first as a Senior Land Planner and later as Chief of the Division of Planning Analysis. In these positions his superior was the well-known city planner Edmund Bacon. When, in 1952, the State of Pennsylvania required all public servants to sign a "loyalty oath" he resigned in protest, and worked thereafter as a private planning consultant.

It was our good fortune that Dr. Blumenfeld left the United States in 1955 to become Assistant Director of the newly created Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. He remained in this position until 1961, at which time he became a member of the staff of the University of Toronto and engaged himself as a private consultant to cities and state and federal governments all over the world.

My personal acquaintanceship with Hans Blumenfeld dates from the winter of 1954-55 when, as Chairman of the Ontario Division of the Community Planning Association of Canada, I was called by the first Chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, Frederick G. Gardiner, to a meeting to discuss the future of the planning organization in the newly formed administration of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

The circumstances of this period I have described in detail in my best non-selling book Governing Metropolitan Toronto, published by the University of California in 1972. Those of us who were active in citizens' organizations in the fields of housing, planning and urban development, greatly feared the possibility that the first administration of

Metro Toronto would be interested solely in the expansion of physical services toward a greater urban expansion. Since we were fundamentally interested in the provision of adequate supplies of housing for families in the lower half of the income distribution, we saw the necessity of fundamental and rapid expansion of sewage disposal and water supply facilities, transportation services, arterial roadways and the like. Nevertheless, we were uneasy because of a sequence of events which led us to believe that Chairman Gardiner was not in favour of the concepts of co-ordinated city planning, and we knew that a number of the elected members of Metro Council (elected, that is, through their offices in the thirteen constituent municipalities) were clearly unfriendly toward a wise and concerted control of urban expansion through the concepts and techniques of urban and regional planning. The sequence of events was somewhat like the following:

1. In setting up a Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board the Chairman had invited the Director and the number two person in the City of Toronto Planning Board to move into the new administration.
2. The former Director of the City of Toronto Planning Board, who had become the Director of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, promptly passed away.
3. The remaining professional person was relatively young and inexperienced, and was not likely to command the respect of the tough, hard-bitten trial lawyer which was the personality of the Metro Chairman.
4. Within a year the Chairman and Members of the Council expressed grave reservations concerning the process of planning, and the members of the Community Planning Association of Canada, Ontario Division and Metro Toronto branch, were greatly worried.

On the occasion of the meeting referred to the Chairman listened to views of invited guests, including a Consultant from Detroit in the person of the well-known and respected planner, Walter Blucher. At the conclusion of the meeting we had apparently agreed that what was needed on the Metro Toronto Planning Board were two professional persons with very different talents: a technical planner, and a highly skilled communicator who would sell the notion of planning to the various Councils in the constituent municipalities and to the public at large.

With our lack of information and lack of knowledge we saw the incumbent professional planner as the technical

person, and the senior, well-respected and well-experienced Hans Blumenfeld from Philadelphia as the "Front Man" who would sell planning to the Chairman and to the community.

At that time we didn't know, as Norman Pressman has pointed out, that throughout his long career Dr. Blumenfeld has at no time wanted to be the senior person in any organization in which he has worked, either on a professional or voluntary basis. He prefers to work quietly, on a highly technical and skilful level, and to make his contribution as a theoretician and a technician rather than as a public relations specialist. We were, therefore, very surprised when the roles we had picked out for the two men were completely reversed once Hans Blumenfeld arrived in Metropolitan Toronto. Our initial concept of the roles to be taken reflected our concern about the inexperience of the younger man, and the belief that only a person of Hans's reputation could sell urban planning to the sceptical politicians of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. As it turned out, of course, the roles assumed respectively by the "younger man", Murray Jones, and Hans were entirely satisfactory, and they formed the basis for a productive relationship over the next several years.

In all of Dr. Blumenfeld's work he has stressed economic and social effects, and he has emphasized the interdependence of physical, social and economic renewal. This evidence of remarkable prescience is further illustrated in an article which appeared in the journal Land Economics, August 1944, entitled "A Neglected Factor in Estimating Housing Demand". The paper was a study of the role of non-family households in which Hans predicted that high national income would lead to a vast expansion of housing demand from this source. This forecast was published almost forty years ago and no one attending this conference can doubt the significance of the vast expansion of non-family households which began to show itself in the American census of 1960 and the Canadian census of 1961, and which has been a significant factor in influencing both housing supply and demand ever since.

In many ways, therefore, Hans Blumenfeld has had not merely an unusually long but a remarkable career. His capacity to explain complex subjects in language which appears and is relatively simple and understandable has been noted by several authors. His advocacy of all efforts toward peace, surely influenced by his experience in World War I and his personal losses, has been long standing and preceded the more active movements which began in the late

1960s. His capacity to speak, write and publish in various languages--German, Russian, French and English among others--has been a notable achievement when most persons in the planning field are fortunate to be able to write in intelligible English.

Those of you who are here today to honour Hans Blumenfeld are among a great many persons who have somehow sensed that his opinions were wise and founded upon human reason and sympathy. In dealing with urban problems of immense complexity he, among a very few persons of our time, has achieved an almost immaculate reputation. I am pleased to have had this honour to salute Hans Blumenfeld on your behalf. I know that all of you will join me in wishing him continued good health and the opportunity to continue his wise contribution to the development of our times.

NOTE:

This is the text of the luncheon address given by Dr. Rose on 4 November, 1983.

Summing Up

HANS BLUMENFELD

My dear friends, thank you very, very much for being here; it's much more than I ever could expect and think of, and I'm really grateful to you for coming here. Life is funny. For the first half of my life I think people rather underestimated me a bit. It didn't worry me very much really, because I've always been enough of an arrogant cuss to say "Well, if they reject me, that's their loss, not mine". What's happening in the second half is that people really overestimate me, up to this mad crescendo of today--it's much more dangerous, because I like of course playing around in these warm waves of flattery which are sent to me, and there is a danger that I'll end up believing this stuff. Now with the clear, materialist eye with which my friend Len Gertler credits me, I discern the real cause of your admiration. It's very simple: every generation rejects the generation of its fathers and romanticizes the generation of its grandfathers. I'm old enough to be the grandfather of most of you so that's why you say all those things. As you know, current fashion puts a high value on Victorian relics, and I just happen to be one of them.

Well, to talk seriously, in addition to the pleasure of receiving flattery, and the greater pleasure of meeting many old friends, I've also had the very great pleasure of listening to a number of really outstanding presentations. Brian Berry gave us a very profound insight into what's going on. What was new to me, and of course disquieting, were his findings--and they seem to be rather convincing--that the shift from secondary to tertiary production, which we are all aware is a dominant trend of this century in advanced countries, means an increasing inequality economically. And it is, of course, disturbing if that is true and it is hard to see that it would not be true.

Michael Goldberg was not convinced; but frankly, while I would like to have been convinced by his counter-arguments, I was not. He pointed out that we, in Canada, have with some success, created so-called mixed residential environments. Now, mixed residential environments may or may not be an unmixed blessing, but one thing they certainly can't do is to make the poor richer or the rich poorer. So I don't think this really dissipates the problem raised by Brian Berry. Well, as you remember, following their presentations, there was a very searching discussion by Len Gertler about what he called "the dilemma of metropolitan planning and metropolitan government"; I think what he really meant were the limitations--of course there are limitations. He was, of course, right to point out that there are other powers that determine the fate of our society, not only the higher levels of government but the multinational corporations with whom even big governments cannot really cope. And they certainly decide very largely what our fate is. Certainly he is right in saying distributional problems cannot be really solved by a metropolitan government. But it seems to me that this somehow identifies any problems of the living environment too closely with distributional problems. They are not identical and, as Alan Waterhouse emphasized in his later statement, there is still quite a bit to be done which can be done by planners on the metropolitan as well as other levels.

I'm also not sure that we don't over-rate the residential segregation that actually occurs in our society. Because all the apartments or houses look alike, doesn't mean that all the people living there are alike and I would really like more empirical evidence concerning the range of people, by various characteristics, who live in the same type of houses. I think it's much greater than we usually assume. But I may be wrong and it should be investigated.

Gerry Hodge looked at the same process. We were all agreed, all the speakers were agreed, that the process which is now going on, and this is something which interests me too, is the spreading out of the metropolitan areas beyond the boundaries which have been defined by the census; this fringe beyond the metropolitan area is neither urban nor rural but is both. It is both an urbanization of the countryside and a ruralization of the people whom we usually consider urban, people really involved in urban activities--secondary, tertiary activities. It is one of the interesting cases where the continuation of an old trend in some way means a

reversal. It is the continuation of a trend which has been going on for over a century, that the metropolis, the big city, expands farther and farther, as means of transportation and communication develop, into the countryside so that now, with some justice, the changes can be interpreted as a reversal of the trend to the metropolis. It's both a reversal and a continuation of the trend. Gerry Hodge tried to look at it from the other side, from his studies of the small towns and the individuality which the small towns still preserve even if they are drawn into the metropolitan orbit. The changes which they undergo, he admits when we discuss it, are of course stronger if they are closer to the centre; both positive and negative changes which occur in these small towns have their origins in the metropolis.

So much about the first session, which dealt in a way with what are probably the most important questions. Then we had the discussion, which I found very interesting, about the transportation problems in which Juri Pill managed to present his points very clearly and precisely and quite convincingly. What I would take a bit of issue with is, in fact, the terminology. Why do we really talk about transit running being paid for out of the fare box and subsidies. I would rather talk about selling transit retail and selling it wholesale. And I can get it for you wholesale. When transit developed in the nineteenth century, it was an alternative to walking and, of course, the only people who benefitted were the people who rode it, and it was perfectly natural that they paid for the full cost of it plus the profit for the entrepreneur. Today it's a very different situation. Of course, the people who ride the transit benefit, and I'm one of them. But we are not the only ones. All of you benefit, because what transit does in the present situation is to take cars off the street. And taking cars off the street is a great benefit to everyone in the community because car-driving in cities has quite a number of social costs, or, as I prefer to call them, third person malefits. It malefits everybody who moves on the streets, transit vehicles, trucks, delivery wagons, emergency vehicles, police, fire trucks--anything--including pedestrians and bicyclists. It's a great nuisance and to decrease this nuisance is worth paying for.

Second, of course, it has a negative effect on the environment: pollution, noise, vibration, etc. And, probably the most serious and least discussed social cost: it's dangerous. It kills and cripples people and if you can

reduce that, it's very important. The constant danger, of course, also means nervous strain on those who aren't actually killed or crippled but are afraid that they might be. So it's justified that the community generally pay for transit to reduce these costs.

Third, one of the groups who benefit from transit are the car drivers: if other cars are taken off the street they can drive, and if the transit doesn't take them off, they can't. The second benefit of transit, of course, goes to all of us automatically. The other two are complementary, so why shouldn't everybody pay? Why shouldn't we collect it just from taxes and then let everybody ride, which would have great advantages in speeding up and easing up transit and create some savings in the cost of controlling it. This is one of my pet theories and I don't want to miss the chance to sell it.

Ron Rice's paper was really very interesting and, I think, an excellent presentation of the changing approaches, and it was also an illustration of the wide swing of the pendulum. I don't think we were quite as stupid in the first period, in the fifties and sixties, and didn't see anything except the performance, and I'm not quite sure this so-called third period in which we are supposed to be now really means very much. It seems to me rather a part of this rather defeatist attitude to planning which has replaced the over-confidence which reigned not so long ago and they are both equally unjustified.

Josef Kates commented on the importance of not only being able to analyze a problem and propose a solution, but to convince other people that that is the right solution, is really one of the most important things in the planning field. You can have any amount of good ideas, but if you can't convince other people and the powers that be that these ideas are good, then they're just good for the waste-paper basket.

I forgot to mention Ralph Gakenheimer's comments which were very interesting also. His comments, which were quite insightful, were on the changes of attitude, I think, and these have lots to do with the political aspect.

Then this morning my good friends Jeanne Wolfe and Guy Legault spoke. Now Jeanne, and I'm grateful to her, was the only one to try to answer the questions that I had sent out. I asked what makes a house a home and I think she is, of course, quite right: it means security and warmth, but how do you achieve that? I think it's just a question of

time. It takes time to make a house a home and it takes time to transform a settlement into a town and a city. There is just no substitute for time. Several years ago a German sociologist published a paper which raised a great number of questions in Germany about the inhospitability of our new towns and, of course, he was right. But to a considerable extent they're inhospitable because they're new. They just have to be lived in to be liveable. And that is one problem for which there is no answer. But more can be done to make them liveable than we are doing now.

Then the other question. Jeanne said I had written a paper about the upper level of density and I should write one about the lower level. Well, I did that in 1949 in a paper presented to ASPO, and I raised the question of what really are good residential densities and who knows what are good residential densities, and with my usual arrogance I said, "I do". It's between 12,000 and 60,000 people per square mile. And I still stick to that. So I've answered her question. But she didn't answer my sixty-four dollar question, one which I have posed to myself but which I haven't been able to answer for quite a number of years, and that is this: Why do all governments and all political parties, media, etc. assume that you need a housing policy when nobody thinks we need a clothing policy? And very few pay any attention to a food policy. Food is certainly as important if not more important than housing. It's funny--I haven't been able to answer it.

Jeanne Wolfe confirms what we have known for one hundred years--it's always good to confirm it again--that the lower the income, the higher the percentage that has to be spent for housing. And as she said, in the lowest income group that is 35 per cent, and they can't afford it. Now I don't think Jeanne really wanted to say that 25 per cent is what everybody can afford for housing, because people with an income of \$4,000 per year can't afford 25 per cent. They can just afford 0.00 per cent. Then they haven't enough left.

I'll start from two things which Jeanne Wolfe also said and which I think are roughly correct. Twenty per cent of our population cannot afford housing and she presented a table about the percentage of the national income distribution by deciles, and according to these assumptions, the third decile is able to afford housing. The lowest two can't. It's easy to calculate, if you take 20 per cent from the highest decile and 5 per cent from the second highest, which really wouldn't mean serious hardship for either group, you

could raise groups one and two to the level of group three. So I think we really don't have a housing problem; we have an income problem. It's a problem of income distribution. If you look at our census, we have an enormous amount of housing; we have no shortage. We have almost two rooms per person, something quite unprecedented in history. It's a question of maldistribution. And the way to correct it is the redistribution of income more than anything else. I wouldn't say that other policies are not also needed, but I think that's the basic thing. You all know the title of the Dennis-Fish report: "Programs in Search of a Policy". And of course the governments didn't like the title; I think the title is really still too generous. It really should be "Programs in Search to Avoid Having a Policy". In a way, there is a policy, but it's not a housing policy; it's a policy which all governments, whether they are monarchic or democratic or whatever, always have followed. Goethe described it over one hundred and fifty years ago: he said, "If you want to live happily, do as the princes do. Have two big sacks, one to take and one to give". In other words, rob Peter to pay Paul and rob Paul to pay Peter. The democratic version is rob Peter to buy Paul's vote and rob Paul to buy Peter's vote. And it works, so you can't say that it's an unworkable policy, but it's not a housing policy.

When we subsidize housing in any way, and there are many open and hidden ways, what are we really doing? If we really seriously tried to subsidize housing for people who can't afford housing, lower-income people, we would transfer money from the wealthier to the poorer segments of the population--income transfer. I'm all for that. But we do something else which disturbs me. We make the budget for the family. We say you have to pay for housing, not for food, not for clothing, not for beer, not for cigarettes--you have to bum your cigarettes like I do--and how justified is it? From the reports which my friend Guy Legault still sends me, I find that the actual annual cost of the housing that his organization built, and it really has done everything to get good housing at low cost, is at least \$5,000 per year. Now take a family with \$4,000--and while I'm simplifying--a family of \$4,000 with a 25 per cent rent would pay \$1,000 for one of these dwelling units in a subsidized housing project. And we, the taxpayers, pay \$4,000. Now wouldn't the family be better off if we just gave them the \$4,000? It would double their income. Would they decide to pay \$5,000 out of their \$8,000 income for housing? No, they

would pay \$2, 000 and the rest for food, etc. and probably would be better off. And I think this is a serious question we really should consider when talking about housing problems.

And in indirect ways, it came up also in the very interesting presentations which we got about the many various aspects of rehabilitation and co-operatives. At some point, it's always who pays for whom? What do you really achieve? What do you really want to achieve? And again I must take issue with my good friend Jeanne Wolfe when she justifies this by saying that homeowners, and other people even more, get a lot of subsidies and they don't need it. Well, that's a bit like saying there are lots of guys who steal a lot and get away with it so I'm entitled to steal a modest amount. I don't quite buy that.

Then we had my friend Kevin Lynch's very interesting talk. I won't say much about it, first because you have heard him talk and second, because all of you are planning to read his book, which is really, very seriously, one of the very best books that has been written on the subject. I guess my disagreements are largely semantic. Certainly he has, under his five categories, developed very well and dealt with all the problems with which we have to deal. He has covered them. I'm not sure they couldn't also be covered under four or five other headings. The only point where--and this again is a particular semantic problem--I really disagree is with the use of the word "control". Now control is a necessary means for a lot of both good and bad ends. And of course, for the other four ends which he wants to achieve. But as he really talks of it, what he means is not control but freedom and power which are the same, as Hobbes said three hundred years ago, and I think he should say this. He should say he's talking about freedom and power as a goal. Freedom for the individual because we have the will to power and we want to exercise it and we are not happy if we can't. But of course, if we exercise it, we also restrict the possibilities for others to exercise it--inevitably.

I found it difficult to follow all the sweeping statements of Pierre Dansereau; you really need more time to digest this very rich menu. But it's certainly very necessary that we learn to think in terms of ecology. We have now--we, mankind--acquired such an amount of control over non-human nature that we can destroy it. We can destroy it both by taking too much out--more out than she can reproduce--and by putting more in than she can digest. The second, the poisoning of the environment, is the even greater danger. We have

to learn to live in co-operation and in harmony with nature rather than try to dominate and exploit nature. Paracelsus said "Nothing is a poison; everything is a poison". And we use the word "pollution". I don't know why we don't use the good Anglo-Saxon four letter word which is "dirt". And dirt, as the old English saying goes, is something in the wrong place. If you put it in the right place in the right amount at the right time then it is a valuable raw material. And we have to learn to get away from the concept of waste that has to be disposed of and get to the concept of the re-use and recycling of the by-products of our production and consumption so that we establish a harmony between man and nature.

But what is of even more concern, with our acquired power over non-human nature is--can we live together? Can we live in harmony with each other? Albert Einstein warned us years ago when he said, "Our ability to control the atom has changed everything except man's thinking". We still think in terms of defence though we know that there is not and there will not be, despite any space phantasies, any defence ever against atomic warheads carried by intercontinental missiles. There is no defence. There is a possibility of deterrence, mutual assured destruction--acronym MAD--which is inherently unstable. We just have to understand that we can't increase our own security by making others insecure. Security can only be mutual and we have to reverse this deadly cycle of fear engendering armaments and armaments engendering more fear. And we have to replace it by a cycle of trust leading to disarmament and disarmament leading to trust. And if planning means anything it means seeing not only the immediate but the more distant consequences of action. If we understand the more distant consequences of our actions, both in our relation to non-human nature and to other humans, then we will understand that we can survive only by co-operation and trust.

Contributors

Brian J.L. Berry is Dean of the School of Urban and Public Affairs and University Professor of Urban Studies and Public Policy at Carnegie-Mellon University. Dean Berry's field of expertise is that of urban and regional development and policy. He is the author of more than forty books and two hundred professional articles. He has been a consultant to both private organizations and governments at all levels. He is currently active in work with the government of Indonesia.

Pierre Dansereau is Professor Emeritus at the University of Quebec at Montreal. His teaching and scholarly interests include botany, ecology and human ecology. He has lectured in Brazil, New Zealand, the United States, Puerto Rico, Mexico, Portugal and France, and has been a participant in numerous international commissions and advisory bodies. He is widely known for his writings on the Canadian environment.

Susan Ellster is a Ph.D. student at Carnegie-Mellon University. Ralph Gakenheimer is Professor of Urban Studies and Planning and Civil Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a former editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Planners (now Journal of the American Planning Association). His research and consulting interests are oriented toward transportation planning in both developed and developing countries.

Len Gertler is a Professor and Chairman of the School of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo. His research and teaching interests are planning and politics, and third world planning. He has written extensively on a variety of Canadian planning issues, and is a Fellow of the Canadian Institute of Planners.

Michael Goldberg is Herbert R. Fullerton Professor of Urban Land Policy and Associate Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration at the University of British Columbia. Together with John Mercer he has been documenting differences between Canadian and U.S. Cities. A recent article on this subject appears in Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise, Comparative Urban Development.

William Grigsby is a Professor and past chairman of the Department of City and Regional Planning at the University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of many books and articles dealing with housing policy and the analysis of housing markets.

Gerald Hodge is Professor and Director of the School of Urban and Regional Planning, Queen's University. His research interests centre on regional planning, and in recent years his work has focussed on the dynamics of change in smaller urban settlements. With Mohammed Qadeer he is author of Towns and Villages in Canada.

Bruce Hutchinson is Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Waterloo. He has served as a consultant on transport systems analysis, land-use modelling and economic evaluation for a variety of municipal, provincial and federal agencies in Canada and Australia, as well as for private agencies. His current research and development activities are in the areas of airport capacity, urban spatial modelling, urban spatial structure and transit efficiency, and inner-city travel demand modelling.

Josef Kates is President of Teleride which provides transportation-oriented computer communications systems and consulting services. He is Chancellor of the University of Waterloo, and a former Chairman of the Science Council of Canada. Dr. Kates was a pioneer in the application of computer technology to analysis of transportation systems.

Guy Legault is currently Director of Le Service de la restauration des logements for the City of Montreal, and President of the Montreal Housing Society. He served as Director of Planning in Montreal for seven years, and as President of the Montreal Housing Bureau for ten years. He is an active member of professional organizations in both planning and architecture.

Frank Lewinberg has held a variety of positions in planning in the City of Toronto, and with private firms. He is currently President of Lewinberg Consultants, and in this capacity has undertaken a number of studies for the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Kevin Lynch's death in April, 1984 was a source of great sadness for urbanists the world over. He was well known for a series of path-breaking books about urban form, starting with The Image of the City published in 1960. His most recent work was A Theory of Good City Form, published in 1981, which provides an extremely insightful summary of a wide range of writing on cities in a prose style which is a model of succinctness and clarity. He was a close friend of Hans Blumenfeld, and was, in fact, the first person contacted in the planning of The Metropolis conference.

Juri Pill is Executive Director of Planning of the Toronto Transit Commission. Dr. Pill has written many professional articles on transportation planning, and is the author of Planning and Politics, a book about the Metropolitan Toronto Transportation Plan Review.

George Przybylowski has been with the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing since its inception in 1974. He has been involved with the development of provincial policies and programmes directed at downtown and main street revitalization, community renewal, and, most recently, initiatives aimed at overall housing renovation and intensification activity.

Ron Rice was formerly Associate Professor in the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Toronto. He is currently a planner with the provincial government of British Columbia and adjunct Associate Professor at the University of British Columbia.

Albert Rose is Professor Emeritus and former Dean of the Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto. He has been an active participant in housing and other metropolitan issues in Toronto. His most recent book is Canadian Housing Policies 1935-1980.

John Sewell is a former Mayor and Alderman of the City of Toronto. He is currently a municipal affairs columnist for the Toronto Globe and Mail. He is well-known in Canada for his insightful comments on urban politics and planning.

Alan Waterhouse is a Professor in the Programme in Planning of the Department of Geography, University of Toronto. His teaching and research interests concern urban design, with particular emphasis on the economic forces shaping the physical appearance of cities.

Jeanne Wolfe is an Associate Professor at the McGill School of Urban Planning. She has recently completed major studies on housing co-operatives in the Montreal region and on development prospects in northern regions. She maintains a continuing interest in the study of utopias.

The Writings of Hans Blumenfeld

Note: Papers appearing in the two volumes of Blumenfeld's collected essays are designated (MM) for those in The Modern Metropolis, and (MB) for those in Metropolis . . . and Beyond.

Canadian Planning

- "Concluding Observations", in a special issue on "The Golden Age of Planning in Ontario 1966-1975", Plan Canada, Vol. 24, No. 3/4, 1984, pp. 165-166.
- Valdene Buckley, et al., "An Interview with Hans Blumenfeld", City Magazine, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1983, pp. 12-16.
- City Planning Issues, report prepared for the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements, Vancouver, Canada, 1976, and published by the Canadian Institute of Planners, 1976. (MB)
- "New Communities in Canada", Foreword to special issue of Contact, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1976, pp. v-vii.
- "The Effects of Public Policy on the Future Urban System", in Urban Futures for Central Canada: Perspectives on Forecasting Urban Form. eds. L. S. Bourne, et. al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974. (MB)
- "Toronto and Toronto: A Comparison", Plan, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1970. (MB)
- "Hamburg and Miseries of a Master Plan", Architecture Canada, May 1967. (MB)
- "The Role of the Federal Government in Urban Affairs", The Journal of Liberal Thought, Spring 1966. (MB)
- "Toronto and Hamilton", Planning Opinion, January 1959.

Design and Urban Form

- "The Origin of the Doric Peripteros: Some Puzzling Questions", manuscript submitted for comment, April 1985, revised from a manuscript of 1938.
- Review of Aldo Rossi, The Architecture of the City, in Queen's Quarterly, Vol. 89, Winter 1982, pp. 868-870.
- "Continuity and Change in Urban Form", Journal of Urban History, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1975. (MB)
- "The Role of Design", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 33, No. 5, 1967. (MB)
- "Continuity and Change in Urban Form", unpublished essay, 1965. (MM)
- "A Visitor Looks at the Montreal Exposition: 'Expo 1967'", an address in Montreal, January 14, 1964. (MM)
- "Universal Dilettante", Newsletter of the American Society of Planning Officials, Vol. 30, No. 6, 1964, p. 75. (MM)
- "Design with the Automobile--the Metropolitan Region", Canadian Art, No. 77, January-February, 1962, pp. 58-61. (MM)
- "The Toronto Civic Square", Mosaic, Architectural Society, School of Architecture, University of Toronto, 1957.
- "Scale in the Metropolis", The Canadian Architect, Vol. 2, No. 9, 1957, pp. 46-48. (MM)
- Review of Leo Grebler, Europe's Reborn Cities in Urban Land, 1956. (MB)
- "A New Theory of the Ventilation of the City", (in Russian) Sovietskaya Arhitektura, 1955.
- "Scale in Civic Design", The Town Planning Review, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1953, pp. 35-46. (MM)
- "On a Peculiar Feature of the City Plan of Mohenjo-Daro", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, January, 1942, pp. 24-26.
- "The Integration of Natural and Artificial Light", Architectural Record, December 1940-April 1941, pp. 49-56, 69-76.
- "Student und Lehrling", Darmstadt Institute of Technology, Student Review, 1919.

Environment

- "Some Simple Thoughts on the 'Energy Crisis'", Plan Canada, Vol. 20, No. 3/4, 1980, pp. 145-153.

- "Criteria for Judging the Quality of the Urban Environment", in The Quality of Urban Life, eds. Henry J. Schmandt and Warner Bloomberg. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1969. (MB)
- "The Changing Urban Environment of North America", Energy Resources and Development Administration Yearbook, University of Kansas, 1974. (MB)
- "The Urban Physical Environment", lecture presented at a Gannett Urban Journalism Center Seminar, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., March 28, 1968. (MB)
- "Our Rivers, Today and Tomorrow", speech delivered in Arvida, Quebec to the Community Planning Association of Canada, June 1962.

History of Cities and Planning

- Review of George Nader, Cities of Canada, Vol. 1: Theoretical, Historical and Planning Perspective, in Urban Forum, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1975. (MB)
- "The Cité Ouvrière of Mulhouse, France", unpublished essay started 1940, completed 1965. (MM)
- Review of Harold Orlans, Utopia Limited: The Story of the English New Town of Stevenage, 1953.
- Review of Pierre George, The City: The Urban Fact Throughout the World (in French), 1952.
- "Mehico y Filadelfia", Arquitectura, January, 1949.
- "Theory of City Form, Past and Present", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol. 8, Nos. 3 and 4, 1949, pp. 7-16. (MM)
- "Form and Function in Urban Communities", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Vol. 3, Nos. 1 and 2, 1943, pp. 11-21. (MM)

Housing and Residential Development

- "Mismatch Between Size of Households and of Dwelling Units", City Magazine, Vol. 7, April 1984, pp. 28-32.
- On prices of Residential Lots and Houses: A Critical Evaluation of the Data and Conclusions of the Greenspan Report. Toronto: Papers on Planning and Design, No. 25, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto, 1980.

- Review of James Lorimer, The Developers, in The Last Post, November 1979.
- "Housing Form in the Metropolis", unpublished essay, December 1977. (MB)
- Review of Michael Dennis and Susan Fish, "The Policy CMHC Never Wanted", in Programs in Search of a Policy: Low Income Housing in Canada, in City Magazine, Vol. 1, No. 4, May-June 1975. (MB)
- "Housing of Low-Income Persons in Ontario", report presented to the Ontario Advisory Task Force on Housing Policy, Ottawa, Ontario, March 7, 1973. (MB)
- "Good Housing for Everyone?", paper originally prepared under the title "Est-ce qu'il est Possible de Loger Convenablement Tout le Monde?" for the conference of the Canadian Institute of Public Affairs, Montreal, 1968. (MB)
- "The Upper Limits of Residential Density", report to the Montreal City Planning Department, January 1968. (MB)
- "The Impact of Urban Renewal on Family Life", lecture presented at the Trendsetter Convention, Panel Conference on Family Life, 1966, and published in The Canadian Home Economics Journal, December 1966. (MB)
- "L'Habitation dans les Metropoles", Architecture, Batiment, Construction, May 1966.
- "The Role of Conservation and Rehabilitation in Urban Renewal", report to the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, 1963. (MB)
- "Urban Renewal", an address to the Community Planning Association of Canada, November 6, 1962. (MM)
- Review of "The Good Neighborhood", in Death and Life of Great American Cities, in Adult Education, May-June, 1962, pp. 264-270. (MM)
- "Residential Densities", Planning 1957: Yearbook of the American Society of Planning Officials, pp. 119-122. (MM)
- "Residential Densities", Task, 1957.
- "Problems of Urban Renewal", from an unpublished report on the "Riverside" area of Manhattan, New York, 1954. (MM)
- Review of Julius Maurizio, Swiss Housing Estates 1940-1950, 1952. (MB)
- Review of International Labor Office, Housing and Employment, 1948. (MB)
- "Comments on the Neighborhood Concept", Journal of Housing, December 1948, pp. 299-300. (MM)

The Metropolis

Review of John Patten, ed., The Expanding City: Essays in Honour of Professor Jean Gottman, in Planning History Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1984.

Where Did All the Metropolitanites Go? Toronto: Papers on Planning and Design, No. 32, Department of Geography, University of Toronto, 1982.

Have the Secular Trends of Population Redistribution Been Reversed? An Investigation of the Growth of the Metropolitan Fringe in the United States 1970 to 1980. Toronto: Centre for Urban & Community Studies, Research Paper No. 137, University of Toronto, 1982.

"Metropolis and Beyond", originally published as "Au delà de la métropole", Revue Critère, No. 19, Automne 1977; also in Papers on Planning and Design, No. 12, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto, 1977. (MB)

"Settlement Problems in North America", Habitat, Vol. 19, No. 3/4, 1976. (MB)

"Megalopolis: Fact or Fiction?", Lambda Alpha Yearbook and Roster, 1976. (MB)

"The Boundaries of Metropolitan Toronto", a comment to the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, May 1975.

"Growth Rate Comparisons: The Soviet Union and German Democratic Republic", Land Economics, May 1973. (MB)

Review of Boyce Richardson, The Future of Canadian Cities, in Last Post, Vol. 3, No. 5, September 1973. (MB)

"Population: Another View", Thoughts, Science Council of Canada, 1972.

"The Social and Economic Implications of the Physical Characteristics of Urban Development", paper prepared for the United Nations Seminar in Copenhagen, U.N. Committee on Housing, Building and Planning, May-June 1970. (MB)

"Will Metro Continue to Grow?", Toronto Area Research Conference, March 1970.

"Trend to the Metropolis", The Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research, Ottawa, Ontario, 1969. (MB)

"Some Vexing Questions in Urban and Regional Economics", XXIX World Congress, World Congress of the International Federation for Housing and Planning, Philadelphia, 1968. (MB)

"The Meaning of the Inner City in the 20th Century", Focus on Downtown, Manitoba Division of the Community Planning

- Association and the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, January 1966.
- "The Modern Metropolis", Scientific American, Vol. 213, No. 3, 1965, pp. 64-74. (MM)
- "The Urban Pattern", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 352, March 1964, pp. 74-83. (MM)
- Review of Raymond Vernon, et. al., The New York Metropolitan Region Study (9 Volumes), in Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 27, No. 1, 1961, pp. 91-93. (MB)
- "Some Lessons for Regional Planning from the Experience of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board", unpublished report, dated March 3, 1961. (MM)
- "Regional Planning", Plan, June 1960, pp. 122-124. (MM)
- Review of William H. Whyte, The Exploding Metropolis, in Monthly Review, April 1959, pp. 476-486.
- "Metropolitan Area Planning", Journal of the Toronto Board of Trade, Vol. 46, No. 3, March 1956, pp. 16-19. (MM)
- "The Tidal Wave of Metropolitan Expansion", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Winter 1954, pp. 3-14.
- "The Dominance of the Metropolis", Land Economics, May 1950, pp. 194-196.
- "On the Concentric-Circle Theory of Urban Growth", Land Economics, May 1949, pp. 209-212.
- "Alternative Solutions for Metropolitan Development", Planning 1948: Yearbook of the American Society of Planning Officials, pp. 15-24. (MM)
- "The Old City and the New Metropolis", unpublished lecture. (MB)

Planning Methods

- "On Population Prediction", Plan Canada, Vol. 23, No.2, 1983, pp. 59-61.
- "The Most Probable Future is a High Degree of Stability", Plan Canada, Vol. 2, No.1, 1981, pp. 26-27.
- Review of Charles Beaubien and Ruth Tabacnik, "Competition Between Urban and Agricultural Land Use", Perceptions 4: People and Agricultural Land (Science Council of Canada, 1977), in Urban Forum, Vol. 3, No. 5, 1978. (MB)
- Review of Harry Lash, "The Planner: City Builder or Ombuds-

- man?", Planning in a Human Way, in Contact, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1978, pp. 54-60. (MB)
- "On Land Taxes and Land Banking", Plan, Vol. 14, No.1, 1974. (MB)
- "The Planning of the Urban Structure", Tenth Inter-American Planning Congress, Panama, 1974.
- "Land Control and Land Prices", lecture presented to the Community Planning Association of Canada, June 1973. (MB)
- "The Role of the Technocrat", in The City: Attacking Modern Myths. ed. Alan Powell. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971. (MB)
- "A Hundred-Year Plan: The Example of Copenhagen", Ekistics, Vol. 17, No. 99, 1964, pp. 75-81. (MM)
- "Limitation of Simulation of Future Behaviour", Plan, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1964, pp. 4-9. (MM)
- "The Conceptual Framework of Land Use", an address to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association of Geographers, McMaster University, June 2, 1962. (MM)
- "Projection and Planning of Transportation and Land Use", a discussion paper for the National Capital Transportation Agency Conference, sponsored by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, Annapolis, Maryland, October 1961. (MM)
- "Are Land-Use Patterns Predictable?", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 25, No. 2, May 1959, pp. 61-66. (MM)
- "Science and Planning", unpublished essay, 1956. (MM)
- "The Economic Base of the Metropolis: Critical Remarks on the 'Basic-Nonbasic' Concept", Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1955, pp. 114-132. (MM)
- "Regional Environment", paper presented to a symposium: Debunk: A Critical Review of Accepted Planning Principles, The Council for Planning Action, Boston, Littauer Center, Harvard, May 7, 1949.
- "Correlation Between the Value of Dwelling Units and Altitude", Land Economics, November 1948, pp. 396-402.
- "A Neglected Factor in Estimating Housing Demand", Land Economics, August 1944, pp. 264-270.

Russian Planning

- Review of M.V. Borshevski and S.V. Ouspenski, "Russia Grapples with Problems of Sprawl", in The City: Methodological Problems of Complex Social and Economic Planning (in Russian), in Planning, Vol. 46, No. 9, 1980.
- Review of M. V. Posokhin, Cities to Live In, in Contact, February, 1976. (MB)
- "Reconstruction U.S.S.R.", Task, Issue No. 7/8, 1948, pp. 25-33.
- "The Soviet Housing Problem", The American Review on the Soviet Union, November 1945, pp. 12-25.
- "Russian City Planning of the 18th and Early 19th Centuries", Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, January 1944, pp. 22-33.
- "Soviet City Planning", American Review on the Soviet Union, November 1944, pp. 53-65.
- "Municipal Reconstruction", in The U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction. New York: American Russian Institute, 1944, pp. 72-82.
- "Regional and City Planning in the Soviet Union", Task, Issue No. 3, 1942, pp. 33-52.

Transportation

- "Cities and Transport in Evolution", report to Urban Transportation Research Branch of the Canadian Surface Transportation Administration, as part of Transport Canada's study of the role of the automobile. Montreal, Quebec, 1977. (MB)
- "Myths and Realities of the Urban Transit Problem", in Proceedings of the 17th Annual Canadian-American Seminar, ed. J. Alex Murray. Windsor: University of Windsor Press, 1975. (MB)
- "Urban Freeways", Canadian Architect, April 1970. (MB)
- "Environmental Aspects of Transport and Urban Development", report prepared for the Privy Council of Canada, November 25, 1969. (MB)
- "Criteria for Transportation Planning", Proceedings of Symposium on Urban Transportation Research, Organization or Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, France, 1968.
- "Airports and Cities", report to the Civil Aviation Division, Department of Transport, Ottawa, Ontario, July 1968. (MB)

- "Planning for the City in Motion", Habitat, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1967. (MB)
- "Transportation", published as the introduction to a special issue of Architecture Canada, 1966. (MB)
- "Experiments in Transportation--For What?", Planning 1965: Yearbook of the American Society of Planning Officials, pp. 240-246. (MM)
- "Transportation in San Francisco", an address at the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association Transportation Symposium, June 17, 1965. (MM)
- "A Factual Evaluation of Toronto's Investment in Mass Transit", Proceedings of the Institute of Traffic Engineers, 1963.
- "Montreal's Subway", unpublished report, dated December 17, 1963. (MM)
- "Monorail for Toronto?", Headlights, the Magazine of Electric Railways, Vol. 25, No. 11, 1963, pp. 5-7. (MM)
- "Transportation in the Modern Metropolis", Journal of the Toronto Board of Trade, Part 1: Vol. 53, No. 7, 1962, pp. 4-7, 36; Part 2: Vol. 52, No. 8, 1962, pp. 4-7, 36. (MM)
- "Transportation in the Modern Metropolis", Queen's Quarterly, Winter 1961, pp. 640-653.
- "Why Pay to Ride?", The Financial Post, August 19, 1961, p.6. (MM)
- "Transportation and Land Use", discussion paper for the National Capital Transportation Agency Conference, Annapolis, Maryland, sponsored by the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, October 1961. (MB)